DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 216 UD 026 350

AUTHOR Mei, Dolores M.; And Others
TITLE Attendance Improvement Dropout Prevention (A.I.D.P.) Part-Time Jobs Program, 1986-1987. OEA Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn. Office of Educational Assessment.
PUB DATE Mar 88
NOTE 38p.; For related document, see ED 284 411.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Attendance; *Community Programs; Dropout Prevention; Dropout Programs; *Employment Programs; *High Risk Students; High Schools; *High School Students; *Job Placement; Job Training; Part Time Employment; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *School Community Relationship; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

The 1986-87 Attendance Improvement Dropout Prevention (AIDP) Part-Time Jobs Program was begun in spring 1987 to place at-risk New York City, New York, high school students in part-time, unsubsidized jobs that would motivate them to improve their school attendance and academic achievement. Twenty-one community-based organizations (CBOs) contracted to provide appropriate job placements and job-readiness training to 70 to 150 students in 24 targeted high schools. A total of 3,300 students were targeted for services, and 3,174 students were given training; of the students who received such training 1,557 (47 percent) were placed in jobs and worked an average of 6.4 weeks. For students hired while in the program and for whom complete data were available, attendance increased from 82 percent in spring 1986, to 85 percent in spring 1987. Achievement for these students, measured by the percentage of courses passed, increased from 70 to 71 percent during this same period. Participating CBOs and high schools thus fulfilled their obligation to provide staff and training although they did not meet their job placement objective. However, CBOs varied significantly in the number of staff and the amount of staff time they devoted to the program, and the number of training sessions they required each student to attend. Recommendations for improvements are made. Data are illustrated on a table and in the appendix. (BJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Evaluation Section Report
Robert Tobias, Administrator
John E. Schoener, Senior Manager

March, 1988

ATTENDANCE IMPROVEMENT DROPOUT PREVENTION (A.I.D.P.) PART-TIME JOBS PROGRAM

1986 - 1987

Prepared by the O.E.A.
High School Evaluation Unit

Dolores M. Mei,
Evaluation Manager

Phillip Herr
Evaluation Associate

Jan Rosenblum
Evaluation Associate

Barbara Dworkowitz
Elly Bulkin
Evaluation Consultants

New York City Public Schools
Office of Educational Assessment
Richard Guttenberg, Director

It is the policy of the Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, national origin, age, handicapping condition, sexual orientation, or sex, in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact: Carole Guerra, Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator, Office of Educational Assessment, 110 Livingston Street, Room 743, Brooklyn, New York 11201. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may also be directed to: Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York; or the Director, Office of Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

Summary

The 1986-87 Attendance Improvement Dropout Prevention (A.I.D.P.) Part-Time Jobs Program was begun in spring, 1987 to place "at-risk" high school students in part-time, unsubsidized jobs. Twenty-one community-based organizations (C.B.O.s) contracted to provide appropriate job placements and job-readiness training to between 70 and 150 students in 24 targeted high schools. A total of 3,300 students were targeted for services, and 3,174 students were given training; of the students who received such training, 1,557 (47 percent) were placed in jobs and worked an average of 6.4 weeks. For students hired while in the program and for whom complete data were available, attendance increased from 82 percent in spring, 1986 to 85 percent in spring, 1987. Achievement for these same students, measured by the percentage of courses passed, increased slightly from 70 to 71 percent during the same period. Participating C.B.O.s and high schools thus fulfilled their obligation to provide staff and training although they did not meet their job placement objective. However, C.B.O.s varied significantly in the number of staff they assigned, the amount of staff time devoted to the program, and the number of training sessions they required each student to attend.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Part-Time Jobs Program primarily emphasized providing employment of a type that would help motivate students to improve their academic performance and school attendance. Programs were implemented at schools with a student attendance rate at or below the citywide median of 87 percent. Of the 24 high schools participating in the program, 11 had been designated Attendance Improvement Dropout Prevention Program (A.I.D.P.) schools and five had been designated Dropout Prevention Program (D.P.P.) schools for the 1986-87 school year. Program activities centered around job-readiness training and job placements. Training sessions focused on students' interests, skills, and goals. Other aspects of training included practice completing job applications, role playing to prepare for interviews, and discussions regarding employer expectations and job responsibilities. Placement in jobs generally occurred after training, and students worked in jobs as cashiers, stock clerks, computer persons, sales people, messengers, painters, and factory and office workers.

PROGRAM GOALS

The program's main goal was to provide students with jobs of

the type that would motivate them to improve their school attendance and academic achievement.

The program's stated objectives were to place the contracted number of students in jobs, and to provide program participants who needed job-readiness training with an appropriate curriculum designed to improve their job-readiness skills.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Although the 1986-87 Part-Time Jobs Program began too late in the year to permit an adequate assessment of its overall effectiveness, it did make an important start in providing students with job counseling and training, and in many cases, job placement. However, C.B.O. and school staff had little opportunity to work together and develop a joint project because of delays in notification in funding. This problem, in turn, influenced arranging job placements appropriate to students' age, skills, and schedule. On the whole, job-readiness training proved to be the most successful part of the program, partly because some C.B.O.s already had well-established training components and partly because they hired new staff with such experience.

Based on these findings, the following specific recommendations are made:

- Consider establishing centrally-promulgated guidelines regarding program staffing patterns to minimize the disparity between different sites.

- Encourage school and C.B.O. staff to coordinate planning efforts in order to facilitate more effective program implementation.

- Provide C.B.O. staff with appropriate equipment and office space in the schools so as to facilitate the provision of services to students.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction	1
Program Background	1
Program Objectives	3
Scope of The Evaluation	3
Scope of This Report	4
II. Program Implementation	6
Program Start-Up	6
Job Development	10
III. Outcomes	18
IV. Conclusions	26
Appendix	29

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Summary of Job-Readiness and Placement Data as of June, 1987	20

I. INTRODUCTION

PROGRAM BACKGROUND

Purpose

The New York City Board of Education issued a Request for Proposals (R.F.P.) in December, 1986 to solicit proposals from community-based organizations (C.B.O.s) for the development of programs designed to place "at-risk" high school students in part-time, unsubsidized jobs. Students would be employed at least 10 hours a week after school and/or on weekends for a minimum of 12 weeks at or above the hourly minimum wage of $3.35. The jobs were to be of a type that would help motivate the students to improve their school attendance and academic performance.

Twenty-one C.B.O.s* contracted to provide appropriate job placements and job-readiness training to between 70 and 150

---

*The C.B.O.s are Banana Kelly Community Improvement Association, Boy Scouts of America, Church Avenue Block & Merchants Association, Community Opportunities & Development Agency, East New York Development Corp., Edenwald-Gun Hill Neighborhood Center, Educational Planning Institute, Federation Employment Guidance Services, Grand Street Settlement, Goodwill Industries, Jobs for Youth, Lenox Hill Neighborhood Association, Madison Square Boys & Girls Club, Manhattan Valley Youth Program, Medgar Evers College, National Puerto Rican Forum, One Stop Richmond Hill Block Association, Private Industry Loss Control school, Inc., Staten Island Cooperative Continuum of Education, Urban Revitalization Services, Inc., and Washington Heights & Inwood Development Corp.

students in 24 targeted high schools* for the spring, 1987 term. Targeted schools are those with a student attendance rate at or below the citywide median of 87 percent. Of the 24 high schools participating in this program, 11 had been designated Attendance Improvement Dropout Prevention (A.I.D.P.) schools and five had been designated Dropout Prevention Program (D.P.P.) schools for the 1986-87 school year. An A.I.D.P. school is one of 26 high schools chosen to receive funding for attendance improvement programs targeted at students with poor attendance and other at-risk characteristics. D.P.P. schools have programs for similarly at-risk students paid for by tax-levy funds. Three of the 21 C.B.O.s chosen contracted to provide services to two high schools each. The remaining 18 C.B.O.s each served one high school.

"At-risk" students are defined as students attending one of the target schools and meeting one of the following criteria:

-- participated in A.I.D.P. programs in 1984-85 and/or 1985-86 and no longer eligible for the program because of improved attendance and/or grades;

-- currently in the program and who are demonstrating a pattern of improved attendance and/or achievement;

-- receiving or eligible for public assistance including but not limited to those eligible for free or reduced price lunches; or

---

*The targeted schools are Brandeis, West Side, Martin Luther King, Jr., Julia Richman, and George Washington High Schools in Manhattan; John Adams and Springfield Gardens High Schools in Queens; Evander Childs, Herbert Lehman, James Monroe, Theodore Roosevelt, Adlai E. Stevenson, and DeWitt Clinton High Schools in the Bronx; Boys & Girls, Bushwick, Erasmus Hall, High School Redirection, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Prospect Heights, Samuel Tilden, Thomas Jefferson, Lafayette, and Westinghouse High Schools in Brooklyn; and Curtis High School in Staten Island.

-- selected by the principal (or principal's designee) including students living in temporary housing and others judged to be most likely to benefit from part-time employment.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Program administrators set the following outcome objectives:

-- Each C.B.O. will place the contracted number of students in jobs.

-- Each C.B.O. will provide program participants who need job-readiness training with an appropriate curriculum designed to improve their job-readiness skills.

SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The Office of Educational Assessment (O.E.A.) sent survey forms designed to gather information on start-up procedures to the individual C.B.O. directors, the principal of each high school, and the program facilitator or coordinator at each school. The forms collected information on start-up procedures at each of the three points of responsibility. Twenty-two C.B.O* surveys were returned to O.E.A. (Those C.B.O.s that worked with more than one school completed a survey for each of their schools.) Twenty-one principals** and 20 facilitators***

---

*O.E.A. received completed surveys from all C.B.O.s but the Private Industry Loss Control School, Inc., which worked with West Side High School and George Westinghouse High Schools.

**O.E.A. received forms from the principals at all participating schools except Thomas Jefferson, DeWitt Clinton, and Boys & Girls High Schools.

***O.E.A. received completed forms from the facilitators at all participating high schools except Adlai E. Stevenson, Tilden, Bushwick, and Curtis High Schools.

responded to the survey. In addition, O.E.A. staff conducted follow-up telephone interviews to clarify information gathered in the surveys. O.E.A. staff also made site visits to six C.B.O.s and eight schools in May, 1987.* The site visits were made to collect information about job-readiness training, job development, job placement, and monitoring. Approximately 10 percent of the participating students at sample schools were randomly selected and asked by the evaluator to fill out survey forms. A random sample (N=21) of responses from these students were examined for this report. Quantitative data, including the number of students enrolled in the program, their pre-program and in-program attendance and achievement were also collected. In addition, data were gathered on whether or not students were hired, and on the work histories of those who were.

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

This report contains four chapters. Chapter I describes program background and scope of the evaluation. Chapter II includes a discussion of program implementation. Chapter III

*O.E.A. made site visits to the Church Avenue Block & Merchants Association (CAMBA) and Tilden High School; the Federation Employment & Guidance Service (FEGS) and DeWitt Clinton and Prospect Heights High Schools; Goodwill Industries and Springfield Gardens High School; the Madison Square Boys & Girls Club and Theodore Roosevelt High School; Private Industry Loss Control School, Inc. and West Side and Westinghouse High Schools; the Washington Heights & Inwood Development Corp. and George Washington High School.

ATTENDANCE IMPROVEMENT DROPOUT PREVENTION (A.I.D.P.) PART-TIME JOBS PROGRAM

1986 - 1987

OEA Evaluation Report

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert Tobias
NYC Dept. of Ed.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

UD026350

contains information on the number of students who received job-readiness training, the number placed in jobs, the amount of time students worked, and the number terminated from employment. Chapter IV presents conclusions and recommendations.

II. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

PROGRAM START-UP

High School Selection Process

Most of the C.B.O.s participated in the selection process, either by meeting with school staff to discuss the Part-Time Jobs Program or by involving a school with which they had a past working relationship. Of the 21 participating C.B.O.s which responded to O.E.A.'s survey, 15 reported that they had worked previously with the high school they contracted to serve. These past efforts included dropout prevention programs, writing skills workshops, summer employment opportunities, and job fairs at the schools. Only staff at East New York Development Corp. and Staten Island Cooperative Continuum of Education, Inc. reported having had no input into selecting the high schools with which they were to work.

Eighty-one percent of the principals responding to the O.E.A. survey (N = 21) indicated that they had been involved in the selection of the C.B.O. chosen to provide part-time jobs services to their schools. Their involvement ranged from minimal to extensive. At most of the schools, staff either interviewed the C.B.O.(s) or drew upon an established working relationship. Tilden High School staff, for example, sent out letters to approximately 20 potential contractees and interviewed those who replied. The Erasmus principal, however, stated that although the school had been involved, the C.B.O. had been more or less

"thrust upon them" by program directors because of time constraints. Fifteen of the principals stated that they had not worked with the C.B.O. before, and seven that they had. At five high schools, where principals reported not having worked previously with their C.B.O., staff at the corresponding C.B.O.s indicated that they had an ongoing working relationship.

Program Planning

Staff at both C.B.O.s and high schools had limited time to plan for the Part-Time Jobs Program. C.B.O. staff had from a few days to three and one-half weeks to prepare their proposals, which they submitted by January 6, 1987. Twenty-four percent of the principals reported that they were informed of their participation in November, 1986, 28 percent in each December, 1986, and January, 1987, and 19 percent in February, 1987.

Staff at most of the C.B.O.s (86 percent) would have preferred to spend more time cooperatively developing a plan for the Part-Time Jobs Program. Of the C.B.O.s, nine percent spent very little time planning with the school, 45 percent spent some time, 32 percent spent quite a lot of time, and 14 percent spent a great deal of time. An overwhelming number of C.B.O.s reported difficulty in implementing the program because of time constraints. C.B.O. staff pointed out that more time is needed to recruit professionals; organize staff; coordinate effectively with the school; assess, train, place and evaluate an appropriate student population.

Although the principals were more satisfied than the C.B.O.s

with the amount of time available for joint planning, nearly half (43 percent) of the principals responding indicated a need for increased planning time. The remainder indicated that they had spent sufficient time on program design. (The principal at one of these schools, however, stated that school staff had spent no time at all on planning with their C.B.O.) Nineteen percent of the principals replied that they were able to spend some time on planning, and 24 percent each spent quite a bit or a great deal of time planning. However, 19 percent reported having had little planning time and 14 percent had none at all. These principals identified as problems a lack of sufficient background information and inflexible selection criteria and implementation deadlines.

C.B.O. and School Staffing

The C.B.O.s varied in size and the extent of resources immediately available to them. C.B.O. staff members ranged in number from two to 12, the average being six, with 12 to 100 percent (averaging 67 percent) of staff member's time devoted to the Part-Time Jobs Program. Some C.B.O.s had to recruit job developers and job-readiness trainers, particularly those with direct or related experience in other agencies. In these cases, the C.B.O.s had to delay the start of the program until they had hired staff, usually until March or April, 1987.

Principals had from one to ten school staff members participating in the planning of the Part-Time Jobs Program. The average number of staff working on the program was three. Five

schools were able to assign only one staff member to the project. The principal of F.D.R. High School indicated that 10 members of the staff including seven guidance counselors, worked on planning and coordinating the program. The remaining schools had two to five staff members participating. At each of the participating 24 schools, one of these staff members acted as facilitator to coordinate the Part-Time Jobs Program. Nearly all of the 20 facilitators responding to the O.E.A. survey reported beginning work on the program in February (50 percent) or March (45 percent). They reported working on the program from three to 35 hours weekly, averaging ten hours weekly. They spent this time on student selection, coordination with the C.B.O., and administrative tasks; about half of them spent a great deal of time completing intake forms and performing other clerical duties. As of April 1, 1987, three-quarters of them had referred from 15 to 325 students to the participating C.B.O.s., averaging 121 referrals.

Space

Nearly all of the principals provided space in the school for program activities. Staff at 10 of the C.B.O.s, however, indicated that the space was inadequate for their needs, either because it was too small to accommodate the staff or it was in the basement and inaccessible to students. In two cases, the space itself was satisfactory, but did not have any telephones. Staff at three of the C.B.O.s were highly pleased with the space

provided by the school. George Washington High School was the only school which had no space available for the program.

JOB DEVELOPMENT

Identifying Job Placements

C.B.O. staff had to identify appropriate jobs in the private and public sectors for the targeted student population. Where possible, they were to locate jobs which were near the students' homes or schools. Most often, they sought to develop jobs within the community at small businesses, service stations, department stores, messenger services, movie theatres, supermarkets, and fast food chains.

C.B.O. staff took several basic approaches to developing job prospects. The majority of job developers went out into the community to speak directly to prospective employers about the Part-Time Jobs Program. If an agency showed any interest, C.B.O. staff sent a follow-up letter describing the program and detailing its procedures. In some cases, they made phone calls in response to classified ads in the local paper and to already established contacts. Staff from two C.B.O.s, CAMBA and FEGS, first spoke to students in order to determine their interests and strengths before they began the job search process. Staff from Goodwill Industries and Washington Heights & Inwood Development Corp. chose first to define a geographical area and then to determine the job opportunities within it. Job developers at Private Industry Loss Control School, Inc. had the task of locating very different sets of jobs for students at its two high

schools. For West Side students, they reported making available clerical, customer service, stock, messenger, and delivery jobs. For students at Westinghouse, a vocational/technical high school, C.B.O. staff sought factory jobs which involved making jewelry and doing lamination.

Generally, neighborhood storeowners, messenger services, and large retail stores were the most receptive to the program because they often employed young workers. Nonetheless, C.B.O.s reported having different experiences with these job placement sites. CAMBA staff, for example, found that some large retail stores showed particular interest in the program, but Madison Square Boys & Girls Club staff experienced a general reluctance on their part to hiring anyone under the age of 18. CAMBA staff were able to overcome this resistance to hiring 16-year-olds and placed students of that age who were good in math in jobs at large chain stores.

Job developers at other C.B.O.s encountered a range of problems in placing students. All the C.B.O.s visited with the exception of Washington Heights & Inwood Development Corp. had a bank of jobs and/or job contacts already developed prior to the start of the program. However, many of these jobs were inappropriate for the students. For example, jobs in banks and offices required older employees, specific skills, and more experience than most students have. Although many CAMBA and FEGS students wanted clerical, cashier, or messenger service jobs, placements in such positions were unfeasible because they were

often in Manhattan offices that closed at 5:00 p.m. Even when C.B.O. staff looked for jobs with flexible hours in the students' neighborhoods (e.g., fast food outlets, grocery stores, boutiques, and gas stations), they found that the neighborhood focus greatly limited job possibilities. In addition, some employers were simply fearful of hiring at-risk students.

Job-Readiness Training

C.B.O. staff provided training for students in the skills required to get and keep a job. All of the C.B.O.s reported that they held ongoing job training cycles. Staff at all but two of the C.B.O.s conducted the training sessions at the high schools, rather than at other sites. The number of students attending the sessions ranged from three to 21.

Staff from each C.B.O. determined the length of individual sessions and the total number students to attend. Of the sessions observed, two lasted slightly less than an hour, two took an hour-and-one-half, and two lasted two hours. C.B.O. staff required that students attend varying numbers of sessions. These included FEGS' 10-part hour-and-one-half cycle, Washington Heights & Inwood Development Corp.'s single two-hour workshop, and Madison Square Boys & Girls' one to eight sessions, depending on what each student needed to be "job ready." In several cases, students had to attend three sessions.

Several of the C.B.O.s used more than one job-readiness trainer to conduct the workshops. Two case managers, two work experience counselors, and a project supervisor were all involved

in providing the training for FEGS. Four job-readiness counselors handled the training for Private Industry Loss Control School, Inc. Five Atkins Life Skill Educators provided the training for Goodwill. The Atkins program focuses on self-assessment, values clarification, and problem solving.

Despite variations from site to site, the content of the training was fairly similar. Students discussed interests, skills, and goals. They practiced filling out job applications and engaged in role playing to prepare for interviews. They received information about appropriate dress and behavior, employer expectations, and job responsibilities. Staff from three of the C.B.O.s used materials and techniques from the Atkins Life Skills Program. Twenty-one student surveys, chosen at random, revealed that the participating students had highly positive experiences with job-training. They believed that what they learned was most helpful. Only one student from George Washington High School complained that he received no training and no further information after signing up for the program a month prior to this survey.

Job Placement

In most cases, the students attended job-readiness training prior to their job placement. In a few cases, however, job developers or counselors placed students in jobs without first offering them the training. Counselors' interviews with these students revealed that they either were mature enough or had sufficient job experience to take a job immediately.

Prior to placing students, counselors assessed their school performance, abilities, interests, and experience. Students took math tests, if they needed math skills for a particular job. In some instances, students had access to job descriptions. When possible, staff matched students who had special interests with related jobs. Goodwill Industries used a computer to match students with available jobs on the basis of information which staff members had gathered during student interviews. Staff placed students in jobs as cashiers, stock clerks, counter persons, sales people, messengers, painters, factory, and office workers.

At most of the C.B.O.s, job-readiness counselors informed the students when staff had identified an appropriate job. They contacted students at the training sessions, called them at home, or notified them through the facilitator at their school. All C.B.O.s required the student to meet first with a job developer or job-readiness counselor to discuss the specifics of the job placement. After this meeting, the staff arranged an interview for the student with the employer.

Staff at all the C.B.O.s reported that there were some students who either did not show up for interviews or refused to go for an interview for a particular job. Most often, students refused to go for an interview because they did not like the jobs, particularly those at fast food chains. One student claimed that he could get a higher hourly wage for the same job if he did not go through the Part-Time Jobs Program. Some

students could not take a job because it conflicted with family and other responsibilities.

Monitoring Job Placements

The C.B.O. monitoring of students' job performance and academic standing necessitated regular communication with the employer, the student, and the school facilitator. Staff at nearly all of the C.B.O.s developed systems for monitoring students on the job. They received information on school attendance and academic performance directly from the schools.

C.B.O. staff designed a number of mechanisms for monitoring job placement. Madison Square staff telephoned employers on a bi-weekly basis, called students' homes regularly, and made formal site visits a week, 30 days, and 90 days after placement. Goodwill staff observed students on the job two weeks after they had begun, called the placement site every two weeks thereafter, and periodically telephoned students. Of the C.B.O. staff interviewed, only the Goodwill staff provided students they had already placed with weekly training sessions where they could receive feedback on their work. Staff at Private Industry Loss Control, Inc. asked students to check in with them and made follow-up calls to employers and facilitators; they had scheduled visits to a site three weeks after the start of a student's employment, but, as of late May, had not yet made any site visits. Among the C.B.O.s which O.E.A. visited, only Washington Heights and Inwood Development Corp. staff had no regular schedule for making site visits and rarely telephoned

employers; although staff reported using "follow-up cards" to record calls made to students, an O.E.A. evaluator found that, as of early June, they had made very few entries.

Most of the problems which C.B.O. staff identified stemmed from poor communication between employers and student-employees. Often students misunderstood their responsibilities, but were reluctant to talk to their employers about it. In fact, the majority of the students surveyed said that they spoke to either a member of the C.B.O. staff or school personnel when they had difficulties, not to the job supervisor. CAMBA staff intervened to help prevent some students from being fired. Staff at several C.B.O.s reported that a few students had been fired as a result of their irresponsibility. Staff at only one C.B.O., however, indicated that such problems were widespread; they found that half of the students interviewed poorly and showed up late or not at all when placed. At most of the C.B.O.s, staff dealt with problems on an individual basis. However, Goodwill staff was able to offer ongoing group sessions on work attitudes, as well as individual counseling.

For the most part, C.B.O. staff relied on information received from the students and school facilitators. They required students to furnish report cards before being placed. If they identified any problems, students would either meet with a job readiness counselor or be referred for tutoring. Staff at two of the C.B.O.s visited received little or no information from the schools with which they worked.

Most students surveyed said that their jobs did not affect their school performance. Three students did, however, mention that working late made it difficult to do homework, and one of these students stated that his average fell sharply. Another student credited the program with helping him in school "because I know I'm trying to help myself."

III. OUTCOMES

This section discusses services, including job placement and job-readiness training, provided to students by C.B.O.s. Two sources of information were available: aggregate data compiled by C.B.O. staff members, which is not discussed in depth, and information on individual students that was obtained from student intake and job placement forms completed by school and C.B.O. staff. One issue emerged that made it difficult to assess the extent to which these aspects of the program were implemented. Specifically, school staff completed intake forms on individual students when they made a referral to a C.B.O. for placement. However, C.B.O.s did not always see those students or did not provide them with services. They also frequently provided services to students whom they outreached on their own. This situation highlights problems coordinating efforts between C.B.O.s and school staff.

According to data provided by C.B.O. and school staff, the full contracted number of students was placed at only three of 24 schools; a total of 1,557 were placed in jobs while in the program.* Thus the program did not meet its job placement objective. However, the second objective was met since job-readiness training was provided to 96 percent of the students

---

*The data reported here were obtained from individual rosters prepared by O.E.A. and completed by C.B.O. staff. These numbers vary slightly from data compiled by central program staff.

targeted (program objectives stated that job-readiness training was to be given only to those students requiring it). The data in Table 1 summarize the number of students contracted to be served; the number who received job-readiness training; and the number placed in jobs as of June 30, 1987.

The contracted obligation to provide jobs was fulfilled at three schools: Evander Childs, Lafayette, and F.D. Roosevelt. Tilden High School, which was visited by O.E.A. evaluators, came close to its contractual goal; 92 percent (N = 92) of the targeted students were placed. In this case, the C.B.O., CAMBA, had strong roots in the community and worked closely with neighborhood business leaders. The staff at CAMBA also made an effort to establish good rapport with students. It is also noteworthy that they were able to successfully intervene when any problems arose. The school with the lowest number of placements, Theodore Roosevelt High School, worked with Madison Square Boys and Girls Club. This particular C.B.O. reported difficulty convincing employers to hire students below the age of 18. They also complained of a lack of enthusiasm among participating students.

O.E.A. collected information on individual student participants, including criteria on which students were selected for the program; data were also collected on students' achievement, attendance, and the dates students were hired and left jobs during the program year. Analyses focused on 3,174

students (91 percent) for whom completed job placement and intake forms were available.*

*An additional 309 students for whom only completed intake forms were available were not included in these analyses.

TABLE 1

Summary of Job-Readiness and Placement Data as of June, 1987[a]

High Schools	Students to be Served	Received Training	Number Hired	% Placed of to be Served
John Adams	70	68	34	49
Boys and Girls	100	88	36	36
Brandeis	100	110	81	81
Bushwick	100	140	65	65
Evander Childs	100	201	140	140
Dewitt Clinton*	75	58	45	60
Curtis	75	157	29	39
Erasmus Hall	125	127	57	46
Thomas Jefferson	150	168	95	63
Martin Luther King Jr.	125	199	106	85
Lafayette	100	218	117	117
Herbert Lehman	100	86	30	30
James Monroe	124	79	28	23
Prospect Heights*	75	74	33	44
Redirection	90	92	47	52
Julia Richman	120	159	64	53
F.D. Roosevelt	100	102	102	102
T. Roosevelt*	100	88	18	18
Springfield Gardens*	150	180	98	65
Adlai Stevenson	100	106	28	28
Tilden*	100	159	92	92
George Washington*	100	175	63	63
G. Westinghouse*	100	145	52	52
West Side*	121	158	97	80
TOTALS*	3,300	3,174[b]	1,557[b]	47

* Indicates that a site visit was made to this school.

[a] These figures were derived from individual student information forms completed by C.B.O. and school staff. Aggregate data compiled by central program staff are not included in this table.

[b] Information on school affiliation was not available for 37 students who received job-readiness training or who were placed in jobs.

- The contracted number of students were placed at three of the 24 schools participating in the program.

Data on eligibility criteria for participants indicated that 34 percent were either receiving or eligible for public assistance, including but not limited to those eligible for free or reduced lunch; 30 percent were enrolled in A.I.D.P. and were demonstrating improved attendance and achievement; 20 percent were selected by the principal as likely to benefit from the jobs program; three percent had participated in A.I.D.P. in 1984-85 or 1985-86; one percent were living in temporary housing; and 13 percent were selected for unspecified reasons. Analyses of available data on students' ethnic background indicated that 68 percent were black, 26 percent Hispanic, four percent white, one percent Asian, and less than percent American Indian.

According to individual student records, 1,557 students (47 percent of the targeted number) were hired for at least one job; 114 of these students had second jobs and 14 students were reported to have had third jobs. Nearly half of the participating students in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades were hired for these jobs. Forty percent of ninth grade participants were hired and 56 percent of special education participants were placed in jobs. Those students who had previously been enrolled in high school were hired at slightly higher rates than those who were new to high school: 45 percent of incoming students were hired as compared with 51 percent of students who had previously been in high school, a difference

attributable to the fact that older students were deemed better suited for some jobs than younger students.

Of the students who obtained jobs in the program, nearly 80 percent were still employed by the end of June, 1987. Fifty percent had been placed in their first job by May 12, and an additional 25 percent had jobs by June 12.

Students who obtained jobs worked an average of 6.4 weeks (S.D. = 5.0); the median was 5.4 weeks worked. However, further analyses of student employment patterns indicted differences between groups of students. Specifically, younger students (aged 14 to 16 years) worked an average of 5.6 weeks (S.D. = 4.8); 17 to 19 year old students worked an average of 6.7 weeks (S.D. = 5.1), and those aged 20 to 22 years worked an average of 6.6 weeks (S.D. = 4.8). Analyses of differences between grades indicated that ninth and tenth graders worked an average of 5.8 weeks, eleventh graders worked an average of 6 weeks, twelfth graders worked an average of 7.2 weeks, and special education students worked an average of 6.4 weeks.* There were no differences based on gender--both male and female students worked an average of 6.3 weeks.

---

*A post-hoc analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether differences between these groups of students were statistically significant. There was an overall difference between the three age groups [$F(2,1408)=6.76$; $p < .001$]. A Student-Newman-Keuls test indicated that students aged 14 to 16 years differed significantly from students aged 17 to 19 years in terms of the number of weeks worked ($p < .05$). Analyses of the average number of weeks worked by grade found that twelfth graders differed significantly ($p < .05$) from students in other grades [$F(3,1142) = 3.86$; $p < .009$].

The length of time students were employed was also related to the C.B.O. that arranged job placements. For example, at Thomas Jefferson, which worked with the East New York Development Corporation, the 106 students with complete job information worked an average of 10.2 weeks. The Edenwald-Gunhill Neighborhood Center, which worked with Evander Childs, placed 136 students in jobs; students held those jobs an average of 9.3 weeks (S.D. = 6.0). In contrast, at M.L. King, which worked with Jobs for Youth, the 107 students for whom complete job data were available worked an average of 2.7 weeks, just below the 2.8 weeks worked by the 29 DeWitt Clinton students placed by FEGS. (The average number of weeks students worked is broken down by school and C.B.O. in Appendix A.)

Data were available for 271 students who left jobs obtained through the program. The most frequently cited (35 percent) reason students left their job was that they disliked the type of work they were doing. In light of the fact that many jobs were in fast food outlets and similar establishments, this is not surprising. Twenty-two percent left jobs for other unspecified reasons, 16 percent were fired, eight percent found a better job, six percent had their job discontinued, and six percent found holding a job and attending school too difficult.

To assess whether participation in the Part-Time Jobs program influenced students' attendance and achievement, O.E.A. obtained additional information from central data files for the spring terms of 1986 and 1987. For students hired while in the

program and for whom complete data were available, attendance increased slightly from 82 percent in spring, 1986 to 85 percent in spring, 1987 (Effect Size = .13).* For those who participated in the program but who were not hired, average attendance was 83 percent in both spring, 1986 and spring, 1987. Achievement for students hired, measured by the percentage of courses passed, increased slightly from 70 percent in spring, 1986 to 71 percent in spring, 1987. For students who were not hired but who participated in the program, the percentage of courses passed declined from 70 to 66 percent during this same period (Effect Size = .11). These effect sizes are not considered to be educationally meaningful.

Further comparisons were made between students who participated in the Part-Time Jobs Program and all other students in the schools in which the program operated. For those Part-Time Jobs students with complete data, 51 percent improved their attendance (comparing spring, 1986 and spring, 1987 percentages), compared with 42 percent of other students in those schools. Analyses of achievement data for this same time period indicated that 36 percent of the Part-Time Jobs participants improved in the percentage of courses they passed as compared with 30 percent of the students in the school as a whole. This suggests that

---

*The Effect Size (E.S.), developed by Jacob Cohen, is the ratio of the mean gain to the standard deviation of the gain. This ratio provides an index of improvement in standard deviation units irrespective of the size of the sample. According to Cohen, 0.2 is a small E.S., 0.5 is a moderate E.S., and 0.8 is considered to be a large E.S.

participation in the Part-Time Jobs Program did not adversely influence student attendance or achievement, and may have even provided incentive for students to improve in those areas.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The 1986-87 Part-Time Jobs Program started too late in the year to allow for an adequate assessment of its overall effectiveness. It did, however, make an important start in providing students with such services as job-readiness training and job counseling, and in many cases, job placement. Such a program has great potential to motivate at-risk students.

Unfortunately, during the 1986-87 school year, staff did not have sufficient planning time. The late fall notification about requests for proposals gave C.B.O. and school staff little opportunity to work closely together in conceptualizing a joint project. In addition, although each C.B.O. submitted its proposal in early January, neither C.B.O. nor school administrators could formally commit staff to the program until they had received a notification of funding from the Board of Education. In some cases, C.B.O. administrators had to delay the start of the program until well into the spring term so they could hire needed staff. Almost none of the school facilitators started work on the program until February or March, 1987.

The single term of operations gave C.B.O. staff insufficient time to develop job placements. Nearly all C.B.O.s began with a list of jobs and/or job contacts. However, many of these were inappropriate because of students' age, lack of work experience and specific skills, reluctance to travel outside their neighborhood, and unavailability for work during 9 to 5

p.m. office hours. C.B.O. staff, therefore, needed time to look outside their usual channels to locate job placements. Given time constraints, several C.B.O.s made important strides in placing students as well.

On the whole, job-readiness training proved to be the most successful part of the program. Some C.B.O.s already had well-established job training programs; several others hired new staff with specific experience in providing such training. The content of the sessions was valuable in preparing students for job placements.

Placements almost always followed both job-readiness training and individual interviews with students. In some cases, they had to wait until C.B.O. staff had found appropriate jobs. As a result, few students could begin work until well into the spring term. The comparative shortness of these placements cut into the amount of work experience students received as a consequence of their participation in the program. It is anticipated that this is one of a number of limitations which program staff will be able to address successfully when they have a full school year for planning and implementation.

Participating C.B.O.s and high schools fulfilled their obligation to provide staff and training. However, C.B.O.s varied significantly in the number of staff assigned (i.e., two to 12), the amount of staff time devoted to the program (i.e., 12 to 100 percent), and the number of training sessions they required each student to attend (i.e., one to ten). With some

exceptions, the number of staff members involved in planning at different schools was comparable. However, school facilitators worked on the program from a few hours per week to full time. As a consequence, the degree of staff services and training which students received depended largely on both their school and the C.B.O. affiliated with it. Centrally-promulgated guidelines in these areas would lessen the disparity between different sites.

Based on these findings, the following specific recommendations are made:

- Consider establishing centrally-promulgated guidelines regarding program staffing patterns to minimize the disparity between different sites.
- Encourage school and C.B.O. staff to coordinate planning efforts in order to facilitate more effective program implementation.
- Provide C.B.O. staff with appropriate equipment and office space in the schools so as to facilitate the provision of services to students.

APPENDIX A[a]

School	C.B.O.	Average No. Weeks Worked	S.D.	N
John Adams	Richmond Hill Block Assoc.	3.1	3.1	34
Boys and Girls	Medgar Evers College	9.4	4.6	34
Brandeis	Manhattan Valley	6.6	5.8	80
Bushwick	Grand Street Settlement	3.6	3.6	64
Evander Childs	Edenwald-Gunhill Neighborhood Ctr.	9.3	6.0	136
DeWitt Clinton	F.E.G.S.	2.8	2.2	29
Curtis	S.I. Coop. Ctr. of Educ.	7.8	4.6	29
Erasmus Hall	Boys Scouts of America	6.3	4.8	56
Thomas Jefferson	East New York Dev. Corp.	10.2	4.8	106
M.L. King	Jobs for Youth	2.7	3.3	107
Lafayette	Urban Revitalization Services	5.9	4.9	116
Herbert Lehman	Edenwald-Gunhill Neighborhood Ctr.	9.8	4.9	30
James Monroe	National Puerto Rican Forum	4.4	4.8	24
Prospect Heights	F.E.G.S.	5.3	3.5	32
Redirection	Comm. Oppt. & Dev. Agency	6.5	5.3	51
Julia Richman	Lenox Hill Neighborhood Assoc.	5.5	4.0	65
F.D. Roosevelt	Education Planning Inst.	4.9	4.7	51
T. Roosevelt	Madison Square Boys & Girls Club	6.7	5.3	18
Springfield Gardens	Goodwill Indust.	6.8	4.3	61
Adlai Stevenson	Banana Kelly Commun. Improv. Assoc.	3.9	2.8	28
Tilden	Church Avenue Block Assoc.	6.4	4.6	92
G. Washington	Washington Hgts. & Inwood Dev. Corp.	5.4	4.4	59
G. Westinghouse	Private Indust. Loss Control	5.5	1.6	26
West Side	Private Indust. Loss Control	7.1	3.9	96
TOTALS		6.3	5.0	1,430

[a] These figures were obtained from the data retrieval forms completed by C.B.O. and school staff, and include only those students for whom complete information was available.